

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 have been examined. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 13, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and claims 2, 6, 7, 12, 14-16, 18, 21, 23, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over WO 02/084637 to Engle et al. ("Engle")**

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 13, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Engle.

**A. Claim 1**

Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Engle. For example, claim 1 relates to a display apparatus that comprises a three dimensional display device, which has a plurality of display surfaces, an image specification device, and a control device.

The control device generates an operation signal corresponding to an image portion specified by the image specification device. Also, the control device controls, in accordance with an operation state of an electronic device to which the operation signal is supplied, the three-dimensional display device to display images that are indicative of operable operation keys with which the electronic device can be operated, on the one of the plurality of display surfaces, and to display other images that are indicative of non-operable keys on another display surface.

The Examiner maintains that Figs. 2a and 2b of Engle teach a three dimensional display device, which has a plurality of display surfaces 1 and 2, and that the reference inherently suggests an image specification device and a control device, as claimed. However, Engle does not disclose or suggest controlling, in accordance with an operation state of an electronic device, the display device to display images that are indicative of operable operation keys with which the

electronic device can be operated, on the one of the plurality of display surfaces, and to display other images that are indicative of non-operable keys on another display surface. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Engle.

**B. Claims 3-5**

Since claims 3-5 depend upon claim 1, Applicants submit that they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**C. Claim 8**

Since claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection of the claim is moot.

**D. Claim 9**

Since claim 9 depends upon claim 1, Applicants submit that it is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

**E. Claim 10**

Since claim 10 contains features that are similar to some of the features discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, Applicants submit that the claim is patentable for similar reasons.

**F. Claims 11, 13, 17, 19, 20, and 22**

Since claims 11, 13, 17, 19, 20, and 22 depend upon claim 1, Applicants submit that they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**G. Claims 25 and 26**

Since claims 25 and 26 contain features that are similar to some of the features discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, Applicants submit that they are patentable for similar reasons.

**II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Engle**

Claims 2, 6, 7, 12, 14-16, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engle. Since such claims depend upon claim 1, Applicants submit that they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Engle and the alleged admitted prior art ("AAPA")**

Claims 21, 23, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engle and the AAPA. Since such claims depend upon claim 1, and since the AAPA does not cure the deficient teachings of Engle with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

**IV. Newly added claims**

Applicants have added new claims 27 and 28 to provide more varied protection for the invention. Since claim 28 contains features that are similar to some of the features discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, Applicants submit that it is patentable for similar reasons. Also, since claim 28 depends upon claim 27, Applicants submit that it is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 10/696,558

Attorney Docket No. 78214

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Grant K. Rowan  
Registration No. 41,278

Date: January 18, 2007